4th March 1954]

தொழிலாளிகளுக்குமிடையே தகராறு இருக்கிறதென்று நினைத்து, அவர்களாகவே அந்த விஷயத்தைத் தொழில் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அனுப்பவேண்டும் என்று சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டாலும்கூட, அந்த தொழில் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அனுப்ப மறுப்பதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன ?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"I am afraid the hon. Member is wrong. Under section 10 (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, if the employers and the employees together write to the Government that they are agreeable to the matter being referred to the Tribunal, the duty of the Government is to see if that Union represents the majority of the employees and if it does, the Government have no option but to refer the matter to the Tribunal. I am afraid the information supplied by the hon. Member is wrong."

SRI P. VENKATESHA SHOLAGAR :—"இத்தகைய விஷயங்களில் தொழில் கோர்ட்டோ அல்லது முக்கூட்டுக் கமிட்டியோ செய்கின்ற முடிவை சர்க்கார் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவராமல் காலதாமதம் செய்வது முதலாளிகளுக்குப் பயந்தா ? அல்லது சர்க்கார் வழக்கமாக முதலாளிகளுக்குக் கொடுத்துவருகின்ற சலுகையின் அடிப்படையிலா என்பதை மந்திரி அவர்கள் விளக்குவார்களா ?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"Most recommendations of the Tribunal are enforceable. If they are not implemented within one month, it is open to the Labour Unions to write to the Government that the awards of the Tribunal have not been implemented. So, one of the main causes why the decisions of the Labour Tribunals have not been implemented is failure on the part of Labour Unions and labour leaders to write to the Government that the particular awards have not been implemented. There are, of course, certain cases where, even though the Unions have reported the matter to the Government, it has not been possible to implement the awards either because the managements get a stay order from the Labour Appellate Tribunal or because there are legal difficulties in the way of enforcement of the awards."

SRI A. RATNAM ;—"இதுவரை முக்கூட்டுக் கமிட்டி எத்தனை ஜில்லாக்களில் சுற்றுப் பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறது ? எத்தனை தொழிற்சாலைகளைப் பார்வையிட்டிருக்கிறது ?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"We have not yet got its Report and when it comes, I shall be able to give the information asked for."

*Stock of rice in Kurumbranad taluk.*

* 40 *Q.*—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there has been no stock of rice in Kurumbranad taluk since about 15th November 1953 and that the societies were getting almost daily supplies from Kozhikode and Cannanore; and

(*b*) whether the Government have received any complaints to the effect that 3,000 and odd bags of raw rice supplied from Vijayanagaram to Badagara Producers'-*cum*-Consumers' Co-operative Society were unfit for human consumption?

[4th March 1954

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (a) It is not correct to say that there was no stock of rice in Kurumbranad taluk from 15th November 1953. There was a total stock of 19,575 bags of rice in the taluk on 15th November 1953. But as the release price of these stocks could not be fixed as soon as the consignments were received, they could not be issued through the ration shops. Some stocks were therefore moved from Kozhikode and Cannanore to Badagara for supply to the ration shops to meet the immediate requirements of the consumers. There were however no complaints about the non-availability of rice in any of the ration shops during this period nor was there any breakdown of rationing in any area, even temporarily.

" (b) Yes. A complaint was received by the Collector of Malabar. The samples of rice were immediately inspected by the Assistant Entomologist who reported that there was nothing wrong with the rice except its normal reddish colour and a negligible percentage of admixture of paddy and that the rice was quite fit for human consumption. He, therefore, recommended that the rice might be issued for consumption. The allegation that the rice was bad and unfit for human consumption is, therefore, not correct."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" The Hon. Minister said that there was no breakdown in the supply of rations. Is the Hon. Minister aware that because the Badagara Society was the only society that had to supply to other villages and because they were asked to take rations every day from other societies, they suffered a huge loss and may I know who is responsible for this loss? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I am not aware of the loss which has been incurred by the particular society. If the matter is brought to the notice of the Government and if there is any just grievance, I am prepared to look into it."

*Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive.*

* 41 *Q.*—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMY NAYAGAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(*a*) the extra expenditure anticipated at the time of the introduction of the Scheme of Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive; and

(*b*) the extra expenditure actually incurred in the real working of the scheme in the districts in which it has been introduced so far?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" (*a*) From such calculations as could be made on estimates and allowing for the savings resulting from the abolition of a number of revenue divisions and Deputy Tahsildars' charges no additional expenditure was anticipated by the introduction of the Scheme of Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive in the State.